

REMARKS

Claims 2 – 5, 7, 8, 10 – 14, 20 – 28, 35 – 38, 40, 41, 43 – 47, 53 – 58, 68 – 71, 73, 74, and 76 – 80 remain in the present application. Claims 1, 6, 9, 15 – 19, 29 – 34, 39, 42, 48 – 52, 59 – 67, 72, 75, and 81 – 85 have been cancelled. Claims 2 – 4, 7, 10, 11, 13, 20, 21, 35 – 37, 40, 43, 44, 46, 53, 54, 58, 68 – 70, 73, 76, 77, and 79 have been amended; no new matter has been added. New claims 86 – 88 have been added; again no new matter has been added.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 8, line 2, Fig. 4 should be changed to Fig. 3, for the purpose of consistency between the description and the drawing. The specification has been corrected as suggested by the Examiner, whereby withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: "resouorces" should be changed to "resources". Claim 11 has been corrected as suggested by the Examiner, whereby withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 58, 61, 64, 65 are objected to because of the following informalities: "...implement:." should be changed to "implement:". Claim 58 has been corrected as suggested by the Examiner and claims 61, 64, and 65 have been cancelled, whereby withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

The drawings are objected to because they fail to show necessary textual labels of features or symbols in Fig. 1, 2 as described in the specification. For example, placing a label, "hard disk", with reference 26, 34 would give the viewer necessary detail to fully understand this element at a glance. A *descriptive* textual label for *numbered elements* 68, 70, 74, 78, 82 in these figures would be needed to fully and better understand these figures without substantial analysis of the detailed specification. Figures 1 and 2 have been corrected as suggested by the Examiner, whereby withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 9, 11 - 13, 15 - 18, 20 - 27, 29 - 32, 34 - 42, 44 - 46, 48 - 51, 53 - 60, 62 - 65, 67 - 75, 77 - 79, 81 - 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kloba et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,717 B1). Claims 1, 6, 9, 15 - 18, 29 - 32, 34, 39, 42, 48 - 51, 59, 60, 62 - 65, 67, 72, 75, and 81 - 84 have been cancelled. Independent claims 11, 20 (now a dependent claim that depends from claim 11), 44, 53 (now a dependent claim that depends from claim 44), 77 have been amended to recite "restricting a scope of the site map" (claims 11 and 44) and "said site map restricted in scope" (claim 77).

Kloba is simply devoid of any teaching or suggestion of restricting a scope of a site map and/or a site map being restricted in scope. Kloba simply states that "the encoding can be a mapping of a parent and chilled HTML elements and/or resources to alphanumeric values designed to present content on the client's display", col. 15, l. 24 - 27. In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that independent claims 11, 44, and 77 are not anticipated by Kloba. Further, since these independent claims are not anticipated neither are the claims depend therefrom. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of claims 2 - 5, 7, 8, 11 - 13, 20 - 27, 35 - 38, 40, 41, 44 - 46, 53 - 58, 68 - 71, 73, 74, and 77 - 79 are respectfully requested.

The Examiner's presumption of joint inventership is correct.

Claims 10, 43, 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentably over Kloba et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,717 B1), as applied to the rejection of claims above, in view of Becker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,937,411). Claims 10, 43, and 76 should be allowable as depending what should now be allowable independent claims as set forth above. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of claims 19, 43, and 76 are respectfully requested.

Claims 14, 19, 28, 33, 47, 52, 61, 66, 80, 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kloba et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,717 B1), as applied to the rejection of claims above, in view of Burner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,282,548 B1).

Claims 19, 33, 52, 61, 66, and 85 have been cancelled. Claims 14, 28, 47, and 80 should be allowable as depending what should now be allowable independent claims as set forth above. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of claims 14, 28, 47, and 80 are respectfully requested.


It is believed that the foregoing remarks fully comply with the Office Action. Therefore, having traversed the Examiner's rejections, reexamination and allowance of claims 2 – 5, 7, 8, 10 – 14, 20 – 28, 35 – 38, 40, 41, 43 – 47, 53 – 58, 68 – 71, 73, 74, and 76 – 80 is respectfully requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 09-0463 maintained by Applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID M. MORLITZ

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicant's Attorneys

By: 

Philmore H. Colburn II
Registration No. 35,101

Date: August 11, 2003

Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002

Telephone: (860) 286-2929

Customer No. 23413